

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 30-50 remain in the application for further prosecution. Claims 30 and 40 have been amended.

Claim Rejections §103

Claims 30-34, 38, 39, 40 to 44, 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,380,007 A (“Travis”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,824,467 B2 (“Schlottmann”).

Claims 36, 37, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ‘007 and ‘467 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,324,035 A (“Morris”).

Personal Interview and Interview Summary

The Applicant notes with appreciation the interview with Examiners Hoel and Hotaling on September 12, 2008. Pursuant to the discussions in the interview, the Applicant has amended independent claims 30 and 40 to clarify the invention.

The Applicant agrees with the Interview Summary Sheet provided at the end of the interview in which the Examiner acknowledged that he would review proposed amendments to claim 30, but such amendments appear to overcome the references as presently applied.

As Applicant explained in the interview, the Schlottmann reference relates to determining a probability distribution based on an existing complex physical model such as a pachinko board. Applicant has amended claims 30 and 40 to require that “the simulation rule data and the physical object data the desired outcome probability distribution is readily apparent and discernible to a player of the wagering game.” Further, Applicant has amended these claims to require that the actions and simulated outcome are graphically rendered “the desired outcome probability distribution is readily apparent and discernible to a player of the wagering game.” As

Application No. 10/657,650
Response to Final Office Action Dated July 9, 2008

explained in the interview, since Schlottmann discloses creating a physical model and then running a Monte Carlo simulation to determine the probability distribution. Thus, Schlottman does not disclose “the simulation rule data and the physical object data being selected to yield a pre-selected desired outcome probability distribution of a plurality of possible simulated outcomes.” Further as the Examiner acknowledged, Schlottmann does not disclose the desired outcome probability distribution being readily apparent and discernible to a player of the wagering game since the probability of balls landing in various slots on the Pachinko board in Schlottmann could not be ascertained readily by a player.

Conclusion

It is the Applicants’ belief that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and action towards that end is respectfully requested.

If any matters may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the number shown.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 8, 2008

/Wayne L. Tang, Reg. No. 36,028/
Wayne L. Tang
NIXON PEABODY, LLP.
161 N. Clark Street, 48th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3213
(312) 425-3900
Attorney for Applicants